



THE UNIVERSITY *of* EDINBURGH

Edinburgh Research Explorer

Truly Satisfied With Your Retirement or Just Resigned? Pathways Toward Different Patterns of Retirement Satisfaction

Citation for published version:

Potocnik, K, Tordera, N & Peiro, JM 2013, 'Truly Satisfied With Your Retirement or Just Resigned? Pathways Toward Different Patterns of Retirement Satisfaction', *Journal of Applied Gerontology*, vol. 32, no. 2, pp. 164. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0733464811405988>

Digital Object Identifier (DOI):

[10.1177/0733464811405988](https://doi.org/10.1177/0733464811405988)

Link:

[Link to publication record in Edinburgh Research Explorer](#)

Document Version:

Peer reviewed version

Published In:

Journal of Applied Gerontology

Publisher Rights Statement:

This is an Author's Accepted Manuscript of the following article: © Potocnik, K., Tordera, N. & Peiro, J. M. (2013), Truly Satisfied With Your Retirement or Just Resigned? Pathways Toward Different Patterns of Retirement Satisfaction, in Journal of Applied Gerontology, 32, 2, p. 164 187, which has been published in final form at <http://jag.sagepub.com>.

General rights

Copyright for the publications made accessible via the Edinburgh Research Explorer is retained by the author(s) and / or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing these publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

Take down policy

The University of Edinburgh has made every reasonable effort to ensure that Edinburgh Research Explorer content complies with UK legislation. If you believe that the public display of this file breaches copyright please contact openaccess@ed.ac.uk providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.



Running head: Satisfaction with retirement

**Full title: Truly Satisfied With Your Retirement or Just Resigned? Pathways Towards
Different Patterns of Retirement Satisfaction**

Kristina Potočnik
Brunel University
Business School
Elliott Jaques Building
Uxbridge UB8 3PH
United Kingdom
+44 (0) 1895267628 (Voice)
Email: Kristina.Potocnik@brunel.ac.uk

Núria Tordera *
University of Valencia
Department of Social Psychology
Av. Blasco Ibañez 21
46010 Valencia
Spain
+34 96 3864566 (Voice)
+34 96 3864668 (Fax)
e-mail: Nuria.Tordera@uv.es

José María Peiró
University of Valencia and IVIE
Department of Social Psychology
Av. Blasco Ibañez 21
46010 Valencia
Spain
+34 96 3864689 (Voice)
+34 96 3864668 (Fax)
e-mail: Jose.M.Peiro@uv.es

* Corresponding author

This study was supported by the Spanish Agency of Education and Science (SEJ2005-05375, within the CONSOLIDER project SEJ2006-14086). Research work also sponsored by the Generalitat Valenciana, Spain (I+D+I groups, 03/195). The first author of the article was supported by the University of Valencia V segles grant.

Abstract

The main aim of the present study was to explore different patterns of retirement satisfaction. Following the dynamic model of job satisfaction, we identify different retirement satisfaction forms. We also examined a set of antecedents of observed retirement satisfaction forms and their impact on psychological well-being. Using a sample of 270 Spanish retirees, cluster analytical results showed four retirement satisfaction forms. These were: stabilized-progressive, resigned-stabilized and resigned retirement satisfaction and constructive-fixated retirement dissatisfaction. Gender, retirement intentions, and voluntariness of retirement transition predicted retirement satisfaction forms. Finally, our findings showed that participants experiencing constructive-fixated retirement dissatisfaction reported lower psychological well-being compared to participants from stabilized-progressive and resigned-stabilized retirement satisfaction forms. These findings provide preliminary support for the study of retirement satisfaction from the dynamic perspective and call for more research on this issue. The findings could also imply the potential value of attending to retirement transition factors to achieve better adjustment to retirement.

Keywords: retirement adjustment; retirement transition; psychological well-being

Truly Satisfied With Your Retirement or Just Resigned? Pathways Towards Different Patterns of Retirement Satisfaction

Satisfaction with retirement can be considered one of the most studied retirement adjustment indicators. Previous research has found that retirees' level of retirement satisfaction depends on: (1) personal factors, such as health and wealth; (2) family situation; and (3) circumstances in which the transition from work to retirement occurred (Fouquereau, Fernandez, Fonseca, Paul, & Uotinen, 2005). That is, retirement satisfaction has always been considered from a quantitative perspective, considering whether retirees experience higher or lower levels of satisfaction. However, previous research suggests that the satisfaction construct could also be examined from a qualitative perspective. One example of such an approach is the dynamic model of job satisfaction (Bruggemann, 1974; Büssing, 1992; Büssing & Bissels, 1998; Büssing, Bissels, Fuchs, & Perrar, 1999). According to this model, different forms of job satisfaction can be developed based on (1) degree, (2) changes in the level of aspiration, and (3) problem-solving behavior. These three concepts could also be applied to other types of satisfaction, such as life satisfaction or retirement satisfaction. From this perspective, individuals are considered not only to experience high or low levels of satisfaction, but also to be motivated to change their situation, depending on their aspirations and coping strategies. Considering these arguments, in the present study we aim to test that retirees not only exhibit low or high degree of retirement satisfaction, but they also experience different forms of retirement satisfaction, based on the dynamic model of job satisfaction. Moreover, we aim to examine antecedents of these retirement satisfaction forms. Finally, our third goal is to explore the impact of retirement satisfaction forms on psychological well-being.

Theoretical Background: Towards a Dynamic Model of Retirement Satisfaction

The dynamic model of job satisfaction was originally developed by Bruggemann (1974) and introduced to the English-speaking community by Büssing (1992). It explains how qualitatively different forms of job satisfaction evolve – under which conditions and by which psychological mechanisms (Büssing & Bissels, 1998). According to this model, job satisfaction is developed through a three-step process. First, this process considers a certain degree of satisfaction or dissatisfaction with the job, depending on the match between expectations and needs, on the one hand, and the actual work situation on the other. Second, the model considers the changes in the individuals' level of aspirations, differentiating between three forms of job satisfaction (*progressive satisfaction*, *stabilized satisfaction*, and *resigned satisfaction*). Finally, two forms of satisfaction are distinguished in terms of individuals' problem-solving behavior (*constructive dissatisfaction* and *fixated dissatisfaction*).

This dynamic framework of job satisfaction could provide valuable mechanisms to understand satisfaction in other fields, such as retirement satisfaction. Retirees who express being satisfied with their retirement may experience different forms of retirement satisfaction. This issue is important since it could indicate different types of adjustment to retirement. In this vein, Isaksson (1997) reported different patterns of adjustment to early retirement, showing that while some individuals adjust positively, others report high negative stress. Hornstein and Wapner (1985) also identified different modes of adjustment to retirement, such as the transition to rest, a new beginning, continuity, and imposed disruption. Apart from these few exceptions, previous research in this area has mainly studied retirement adjustment in terms of degree of adjustment (low or high), following different approaches, such as continuity theory (Atchley, 1999) or role theory (Ashforth, 2001). On one hand, role theory suggests that if a work role has been a central role in one's life, transition to the role of retiree may be stressful, leading to poor adjustment (Quick & Moen, 1998). In contrast, the transition

to the role of retiree of those individuals who have other role involvements or are retiring from an unpleasant job might be less stressful, leading to better adjustment. On the other hand, continuity theory argues that retirement is an opportunity to maintain social relationships and lifestyle patterns rather than the loss of work role (Wang, 2007). Thus, maintaining continuity is crucial for individual's well-being, either by maintaining his/her lifestyle or activities or viewing the retirement as a fulfillment of prior goal (e.g. if planning for retirement was done). Although continuity and role theory proved to be useful frameworks to study retirement adjustment, they both overlook the possibility that retirees could experience qualitatively different types of adjustment. For instance, not all retirees who feel satisfied with their retirement are well-off and some who are dissatisfied with their retirement would like to improve their retirement experience.

To fill this gap, in the present study, we aim to identify different forms of adjustment to retirement following the dynamic model of job satisfaction (Bruggemann, 1974; Büssing, 1992; Büssing & Bissels, 1998; Büssing et al., 1999). We argue that, as in the case of the work situation, an individual develops a certain degree of retirement satisfaction or dissatisfaction, based on the match between expectations about retirement and the actual retirement situation. As noted previously, this aspect of satisfaction has been studied in past research on adjustment to retirement following different theoretical backgrounds. Moreover, the level of aspirations (e.g. being demanding about retirement) and problem solving strategies (e.g. trying to change the situation) could generate different forms of retirement satisfaction.

Specifically, we propose five forms of retirement satisfaction. We suggest that retirees experience *progressive retirement* satisfaction when they feel satisfied with their retirement, and by increasing their level of aspiration they try to achieve an even higher level of satisfaction. *Stabilized retirement satisfaction* is reported when a retiree feels satisfied with

the retirement but is motivated to maintain the level of aspiration and the pleasurable state of satisfaction. The underlying premise of continuity theory (Atchley, 1999) that retirees adjust well to retirement by maintaining patterns of activities and relationships established prior to retirement could be applied to support these two forms of retirement satisfaction. *Resigned retirement satisfaction* is present when a retiree exhibits an ambiguous level of retirement dissatisfaction and decreases his or her level of aspiration in order to adapt to negative aspects of the retirement. As a retiree decreases his or her level of aspiration (e.g. not expecting too much from retirement), he or she is able to experience higher levels of retirement satisfaction again. Role theory (Ashforth, 2001) could provide additional arguments for this retirement satisfaction form. As noted previously, those retirees who are exiting unpleasant job or negative working environments, might exhibit more positive adjustment to retirement but perhaps only because they could have been worse-off if they had continued in their work role and not because they enjoy in their new role of retiree.

Furthermore, *constructive retirement dissatisfaction* is experienced when a retiree feels dissatisfied with the retirement. However, while maintaining the level of aspiration, a retiree tries to master the situation through problem-solving attempts on the basis of sufficient frustration tolerance. Additional support for this form of dissatisfaction might come from the life-span theory of control (Haynes, Heckhausen, Chipperfield, Perry, & Newell, 2009). According to this framework, older adults are motivated to influence their environment using selective primary control strategies (e.g. task persistence or task modification). Thus, although some retirees might be dissatisfied with their retirement, they could be motivated to overcome their difficulties by investing their time, effort and skills in achieving goals and tasks that would improve their adjustment to retirement.

Finally, *fixated retirement dissatisfaction* is present when a retiree feels dissatisfied with the retirement and maintains the level of aspiration, but without trying to master the

situation by means of problem-solving attempts. In line with life-span control theory, when the use of selective primary control strategies is no longer efficient in achieving the goal, older adults shift to other strategies in order to maintain their activities, such as getting help from others or disengaging from the task (Haynes et al., 2009). If still unsuccessful, older adults might abandon the goal to focus on minimizing discomfort and overcoming the negative psychological consequences of failure. In case of fixated retirement dissatisfaction form, these arguments suggest that when control strategies a retiree engaged in to improve his/her adjustment were unsuccessful, he/she eventually abandons active control strategies and focus on staying as well-off as he/she possibly can.

Empirical Background: Measurement and Operationalization

Different forms of job satisfaction have been empirically measured by the Job Satisfaction Questionnaire-Short Form developed by Bruggemann (1976). This instrument is composed of 12 items referring to the degree, intensity and dynamics of job satisfaction. Specifically, one item measures total job satisfaction (aspect of degree), two items measure psychological well-being at work (aspect of intensity), two items assess changes in levels of aspirations (first dynamic aspect), and the remaining seven items refer to different forms of (dis)satisfaction (second dynamic aspect).

Past research found support for the dynamic model of job satisfaction across different professions, although five theoretically argued forms of job satisfaction were rarely found, with some forms even completely missing in certain studies (Büssing, 1992; Büssing et al., 1999). For instance, in his first study Büssing (1992) identified the following forms of job satisfaction: resigned-stabilized (40%), progressive (17%), and stabilized (19%) job satisfaction, and constructive (24%) job dissatisfaction. In his second study, six forms of job satisfaction were found: resigned (25%), resigned-stabilized (15%), stabilized-progressive

(13%), and constructive (13%) job satisfaction, and resigned-fixated (20%) and constructive-fixated (14%) job dissatisfaction. Moreover, in another study Büssing et al. (1999) identified stabilized-progressive (21.7%), constructive (10.9%), and resigned (19.6%) satisfaction and constructive (17.4%) and fixated (30.4%) dissatisfaction.

To our knowledge, there have been no prior attempts to extend the dynamic model of job satisfaction to other types of satisfaction, such as retirement satisfaction. Thus, the primary aim of the present study is to examine whether retirees experience different forms of retirement satisfaction based on the dynamic model of job satisfaction, such as progressive retirement satisfaction, stabilized retirement satisfaction, resigned retirement satisfaction, constructive retirement dissatisfaction, and fixated retirement dissatisfaction.

Antecedents and Consequences of Retirement Satisfaction Forms

The second aim of the present study is to examine the antecedents of retirement satisfaction forms. Past research has looked at a wide range of antecedents of retirement satisfaction that can be differentiated between personal circumstances and factors related to retirement transition.

Regarding personal circumstances, social background characteristics, such as health, income, occupational status and level of education, have been the most frequently studied factors that condition the retirement experience (Kim & Moen, 2001). Fouquereau et al. (2005), in their cross-national study in six European countries (including Spain), confirmed health and financial resources as significant determinants of retirement satisfaction. Similar results have also been found in other studies (Richardson & Kilty, 1991; Taylor, Shultz, Spiegel, Morrison, & Green, 2007). Moreover, a positive effect of level of education and occupational status on retirement quality has been suggested because education might provide

retirees with social skills to appreciate opportunities in retirement to participate in intrinsically satisfying activities (Reitzes & Mutran, 2004).

Moreover, in line with the life course perspective (Elder & Johnson, 2003), marital status was also defended as an important factor in retirement adjustment. One potential consequence of retirement is a lack of social interaction with others (Kim & Feldman, 2000). For married retirees or retirees living with a partner, social interaction with their spouse may not only substitute for interaction with their ex-workmates, but also provide them with a source of consistency and stability (Wang, 2007). On the other hand, single retirees may experience increased financial uncertainty and social isolation, which could lower their assessment of retirement.

Finally, gender differences in retirement satisfaction were also proposed. However, past research found inconsistent results. Some evidence suggested that women had more positive attitudes toward their retirement than men (Atchley, 1982) and that women considered their retirement to be more pleasurable than their male counterparts did (Jewson, 1982). Along the same lines, Isaksson and Johansson (2000) found that women were more satisfied with their retirement than men. These studies are based on the idea that the importance of family and home in women's lives provides continuity between life before and after retirement (Arber & Ginn, 1991). It is assumed that this continuity is positive, providing support for a more pleasurable view of retirement among women. However, some studies found lower retirement satisfaction in women than in men (Richardson & Kilty, 1991; Secombe & Lee, 1986). These results give support to a second perspective on gender and retirement, which suggests that women's work experience, characterized by delays and disruptions due to motherhood, caregiving to others (elderly, sick or disabled individuals) and lower earnings, may lead to lower financial security in retirement, which in turn is related to negative views of retirement (Gee & Baillie, 1999).

Regarding antecedents related to the type of retirement transition, past research consistently associated voluntary or involuntary cessation of work, that is, voluntariness of retirement transition, with retirement and/or personal satisfaction (e.g. Gall, Evans, & Howard, 1997; Kloep & Hendry, 2006; Reitzes & Mutran, 2004; Shultz, Morton, & Weckerle, 1998). These studies found that retirees whose transition to retirement was voluntary adjusted better to retirement than retirees who retired obligatorily. Voluntariness refers to the individual's overall perception of whether his or her transition to retirement was voluntary or obligatory.

Past research has highlighted the role of other aspects related to retirement transition in adjustment to retirement, such as retirement intentions (Van Solinge & Henkens, 2007). High retirement intentions were said to reflect mental preparedness for retirement, facilitating the transition into retirement and better adjustment to it. Voluntariness of retirement transition and retirement intentions do not represent the same aspect of the retirement transition process. An individual can experience high retirement intentions, but still perceive being obliged to retire by his/her organization at a time when he/she did not expect it or under undesired circumstances. Thus, considering both aspects of retirement transition might help us to better explain forms of satisfaction with retirement.

Based on this review, our second aim is to explore whether the antecedents that were related to the level of retirement adjustment in past research are also related to adjustment forms in terms of retirement satisfaction. The lack of previous research on retirement satisfaction forms prevents us from drawing concrete hypotheses about antecedents of specific forms. However, based on the rationale of dynamic model of satisfaction, we could expect that retirees with better health, higher income, occupational status and level of education experience more constructive forms of retirement satisfaction (e.g. progressive or stabilized forms) compared to retirees in poor health, lower income, occupational status and level of

education. In addition, we might predict that retirees who retired voluntarily and exhibited higher retirement intentions experience more positive retirement satisfaction forms compared to obligatory retired and those who experienced lower retirement intentions.

Finally, the third aim of the present study is to analyze whether experiencing different retirement satisfaction forms is related to the degree of retirees' psychological well-being. It has been argued that retirees whose transition to retirement was successful experience higher levels of psychological well-being (Quick & Moen, 1998; Wang, 2007). Satisfaction with retirement could be considered an indicator of how successful this transition was. Therefore, we could assume that exhibiting retirement satisfaction forms characterized by high levels of aspiration, as in the progressive satisfaction form (Büssing, 1992; Büssing et al., 1999), would have a positive impact on psychological well-being, whereas experiencing satisfaction forms with low levels of aspiration (e.g. fixated dissatisfaction) would contribute to lower psychological well-being.

Methods

Sample and Procedures

A paper-pencil questionnaire was applied to a sample of retirees studying in two university programs for senior people at the University of Valencia and at the Polytechnic University of Valencia. These are higher education programs designed for people aged 55 or older, and they do not qualify them for professional practice. Questionnaires were distributed among the participants by two of the authors, who visited the courses after obtaining approval from the management of the programs to access the classes. Individuals who had retired were asked for cooperation, guaranteeing confidentiality of the data. The final sample was composed of 270 retirees (32% were females and 68% males). The average age was 63.86 years ($SD = 5.1$). With regard to marital status, 68.8% of the participants were married, 9.1% were single, 6.9% were separated or divorced, and 15.2% were widowed. The level of education before

retirement was as follows: 39.8% had a University degree, 51.4% had finished secondary education, 8.4% had basic education, and 0.4% had not studied at all.

Concerning the conditions in which the retirement occurred, subjects on average retired at the age of 59.66 ($SD = 4.76$). The average number of years retired was 4.25 ($SD = 3.74$). In addition, 62% rated their retirement as voluntary and 38% as obligatory. Finally, regarding the level of pension income, 16.6% earn less than 1.200 Euros monthly, 49% earn between 1.200 and 2.000, 25.3% earn between 2.000 and 3.000 Euros, and 9.1% earn more than 3.000 Euros per month.

Furthermore, 66.5% of the participants were working in the private sector and 33.5% in the public sector. Concerning the occupational status, 25.7% were in management positions, 32.0% in middle-level positions, 6.2% were supervisors, 17.8% were technical staff, 17.1% were qualified workers, and 1.2% were non-qualified workers. Finally, 18.0% had worked in banks, 7.6% in telecommunications, 13.2% in education, 10.4% in healthcare, 8.8% in public administration, 10.0% in commerce, 9.2% in the car industry, 4.8% in civil construction and 18% in other sectors.

Measures

Income, level of education and occupational status were treated in the data analysis using the categories outlined above. Other variables were operationalized as follows:

Retirement satisfaction was measured by a 12-item scale inspired and adapted from the Job Satisfaction Questionnaire-Short Form (AZK, Bruggemann, 1976). The structure of this instrument is explained in the introduction. The wording of the items is presented in Table 1 (see Results). Participants replied to each item by using a 5-point response scale (1 - totally disagree; 5 - totally agree). Since this questionnaire is a collection of single items rather than a coherent scale, reliability coefficients only partially apply to this scale.

Gender was operationalized as a dummy variable (1-female).

Voluntariness of retirement transition was operationalized in terms of a dummy variable (1-obligatory retirement). Similar operationalizations were also used in past research (Isaksson & Johansson, 2000; Shultz et al., 1998).

Marital status was also operationalized as a dummy variable, recoding the original four categories of marital status as 1-married or living with a partner and 0-single (single, divorced or separated, and widowed).

Health status was measured by applying a single item measure (“My health impaired or even impeded me from continuing with my work”). Participants replied using a 5-point response scale, ranging from 1 (totally disagree) to 5 (totally agree).

Retirement intentions were measured by means of 2 items derived and adapted to our study from the items used by Terry, Hogg, and White (1999). Participants were asked to rate their level of intentions to retire early before retirement took place. The items were: “I had intentions to retire early” and “I was clearly decided to retire early”. Participants replied using a 5-point response scale (1 - certainly not; 5 - certainly). The Cronbach’s reliability coefficient was .96.

Psychological well-being was evaluated by means of a 12-item measure, adapted from the General Health Questionnaire (Goldberg, 1979) (“Could you concentrate well on what you were doing over the past few weeks?”). Participants used a 4-point response scale (1 - more than usual; 4 - much less than usual). Half of the items were reversed, so that higher scores indicated higher well-being. The Cronbach’s alpha coefficient was .88.

Overview of analysis

The examination of different forms of retirement satisfaction was carried out by means of two-phase cluster analysis as implemented in SPSS 15. We used a log-likelihood distance measure to identify different cluster solutions. We examined models with 2 to 6 clusters and

finally kept the most parsimonious solution. Similar procedures were used in past research to identify homogeneous groupings (e.g. Gee et al., 2007). Afterwards, we subjected the cluster solutions to a discriminant analysis in order to confirm the classification of the participants into their respective clusters (e.g. Büssing, 1992). To get a preliminary insight into the relationships between antecedents and retirement satisfaction clusters, we carried out ANOVA (with Bonferroni post hoc comparison test as a conservative test to examine differences between groups) and a set of contingency tables analyses. In the next step, we carried out a multinomial logistic regression (with retirement satisfaction forms as dependent variable), introducing only those predictors that showed significant differences between retirement satisfaction forms in preliminary analyses to simplify the model. We examined odd ratios and their 95% confidence intervals and standard errors. Finally, the relationships between the retirement satisfaction forms and psychological well-being were analyzed by means of linear regression analysis. For these purposes, the retirement satisfaction forms were transformed into dummy variables (Cohen & Cohen, 2003). For all analyses, the obtained results are considered significant at the $p < .05$ level. Moreover, listwise deletion of missing data was used. Analysis of missing cases for each of the analyses performed showed the cases excluded from the analyses did not differ demonstrably on most demographic variables from the cases included.

Results

Retirement Satisfaction Forms

Applying an analytical procedure outlined above, our results indicated a four cluster solution. The obtained clusters were interpreted in terms of degree and intensity of retirement satisfaction, level of aspiration, and high ratings on one or more items specific to a certain form of retirement satisfaction (see Table 1). Subsequent discriminant analysis showed that

93.2% of the participants were correctly classified into their respective retirement satisfaction clusters. Therefore, we could expect a fairly valid discrimination of obtained retirement satisfaction forms.

Please, insert Table 1 about here

As can be observed, four forms of retirement satisfaction were found, which were interpreted as follows: stabilized-progressive retirement satisfaction (41.06%), resigned-stabilized retirement satisfaction (27.05%), resigned retirement satisfaction (14.01%), and constructive-fixated retirement dissatisfaction (17.87%). As can be seen in the Table 1, the pattern for *stabilized-progressive retirement satisfaction* form represents high scores in degree and intensity of retirement satisfaction as well as high scores in aspects that measure progressive and stabilized retirement satisfaction form. At the same time, we observe intermediate values in level of aspiration which indicates stabilized pattern. As for the *resigned-stabilized retirement* satisfaction form, we observe high degree and intensity (above the mean of 2.5) of retirement satisfaction as well as high scores on both, stabilized and resigned aspects of retirement satisfaction. The level of aspiration is at the intermediate level, similarly as in the case of stabilized-progressive retirement satisfaction. Furthermore, in case of *resigned retirement* satisfaction form we observe high scores on both degree and intensity of retirement satisfaction and high score on the items 7 and 10 that measure the aspect of resigned satisfaction. Moreover, we observe a score above the mean of 2.5 on the item 4 (“One cannot expect one’s needs and wishes to be satisfied in retirement”). Finally, the pattern for *constructive-fixated* retirement dissatisfaction form represents low values on degree and intensity of retirement satisfaction. However, we observe high scores on the items that assess the fixated and constructive dissatisfaction aspects of retirement satisfaction (items

6, 8, and 9). At the same time, the scores on level of aspiration were above the mean of 2.5, which in case of item 4 suggests fixated retirement satisfaction form and in case of item 5 constructive retirement dissatisfaction form.

Antecedents and Consequences of Retirement Satisfaction Forms

A descriptive analysis of obtained clusters in terms of studied predictor variables is presented in Table 2. As can be observed, differences between clusters were found in terms of gender, voluntariness of retirement transition, income and retirement intentions.

Please, insert Table 2 about here

In the next step, we carried out logistic regression analysis to confirm the tendencies observed in Table 2. Indeed, our results supported some tendencies of the descriptive results regarding the antecedents of retirement satisfaction forms. We present predictors' odd ratios (*OR*) with their standard errors (*SE*) and 95% confidence intervals (*CI*) in Table 3, taking into account the constructive-fixated retirement dissatisfaction form as a reference category to contrast retirees from satisfaction forms with the retirees from the only dissatisfaction form observed in our sample. As already mentioned in the Method section, only predictors showing significant differences between retirement satisfaction forms were introduced in order to simplify the model.¹ As can be seen, respondents with high retirement intentions were more likely to be in stabilized-progressive (*OR* = 1.92, 95% *CI* = 1.31-2.82) and resigned retirement satisfaction (*OR* = 1.56, 95% *CI* = 1.00-2.43) forms than in the constructive-fixated dissatisfaction form. Furthermore, male retirees were more likely to be in the resigned retirement satisfaction form than in the constructive-fixated retirement dissatisfaction form

¹ The model with all hypothesised predictors was also examined. The results were consistent with current findings, and additional predictors were not significant. These results are available on request.

(OR = .15, 95% CI = .02-.85). Finally, retirees who perceived that they were forced to retire were less likely to be in stabilized-progressive (OR = .26, 95% CI = .09-.74) and resigned retirement satisfaction (OR = .15, 95% CI = .02-.85) forms than in the constructive-fixated retirement dissatisfaction form. Overall, the fit of the examined model is acceptable ($-2LL_0 = 311.19$; $-2LL_1 = 256.31$; $\chi^2(12) = 54.88$, $p < .01$). The introduced variables adequately predict the retirement satisfaction forms (Cox and Snell $R^2 = .26$; Nagelkerke $R^2 = .28$).

Please, insert Table 3 about here

The impact of retirement satisfaction forms on psychological well-being was examined next. Because chronological age, level of education, and gender might be related with individual well-being, we introduced these variables in the first step to partial out their effects in the studied relationships. As can be seen in Table 4, participants from the stabilized progressive form ($\beta = .38$, $p < .01$) and participants from the resigned-stabilized retirement satisfaction form ($\beta = .20$, $p < .05$) reported higher levels of psychological well-being compared to the participants from the constructive-fixated retirement dissatisfaction form.

Please, insert Table 4 about here

Discussion

The main aim of this study was to examine different retirement satisfaction forms, building on the dynamic model of job satisfaction (Bruggemann, 1974; Büssing et al., 1999). Our second aim was to analyze the potential antecedents of retirement satisfaction forms, selected on the basis of past research about retirement satisfaction. Finally, our third objective was to examine the influence of different retirement satisfaction forms on psychological well-being.

Our findings show retirement satisfaction forms similar to those found in past research about job satisfaction forms (Büssing, 1992; Büssing et al., 1999). In this way, our results provide some support for the validity of the dynamic model of satisfaction when applied to other relevant life referents like retirement. The retirement satisfaction forms were interpreted following theoretical background of dynamic model of satisfaction taking into account the degree and the intensity of retirement satisfaction as well as scores relevant for specific form of retirement (dis)satisfaction (see Table 1). The resigned retirement satisfaction pattern was the only theoretically suggested cluster obtained. Other clusters found in the present sample were: stabilized-progressive and resigned-stabilized satisfaction, and constructive-fixated dissatisfaction. It is important to note that the elements of all five types of retirement satisfaction were observed in the present sample. Specifically, as indicated in the Results section previously, stabilized-progressive retirement satisfaction could be defined by a high level of satisfaction and a maintained level of aspiration, while a desire for personal development is also present. In contrast, the resigned-stabilized retirement satisfaction form is characterized by a high level of satisfaction and a desire for everything to remain as it is, although elements of resignation are also expressed. Finally, the constructive-fixated retirement dissatisfaction form represents a low level of satisfaction and a strong tendency to get stuck in dissatisfying situations. However, retirees from this form also show a tendency to change this negative situation in the near future.

Examining the distribution of the retirees in each form, we observe a relatively small proportion of dissatisfied retirees (17.87%). Coupled with the largest proportion of retirees in the stabilized-progressive retirement satisfaction form (41.06%), this result can be interpreted as positive in terms of good adjustment to retirement. It is also interesting to note that a relatively small proportion of retirees experience resigned retirement satisfaction. Whereas past research about job satisfaction forms found up to 40% resigned employees (e.g. Büssing,

1992), we found that only 14% of the retirees in the current sample feel satisfied with their retirement because they think it could be worse. On this point we have to highlight the selectivity of the sample, given that the data was collected from individuals participating in two university programs for older people. Thus, the retirees in the current sample are actively engaging in educational activities, which might explain the large proportion of retirees in the stabilized-progressive retirement satisfaction form and the small proportion of retirees in the resigned retirement satisfaction form. Nevertheless, a considerable proportion of retirees (27%) experience some aspects of resigned retirement satisfaction, although this negative experience is coupled with stabilized aspects of retirement satisfaction.

In line with the second aim of the present study, we found significant differences between retirement satisfaction clusters in terms of gender, voluntariness of retirement transition, and the level of retirement income (Isaksson & Johansson, 2000; Kim & Moen, 2001; Kloep & Hendry, 2006; Shultz et al., 1998). Moreover, as we expected, retirees grouped in more positive retirement satisfaction clusters experienced higher level of retirement intentions than retirees from less constructive retirement (dis)satisfaction forms, such as the resigned-stabilized retirement satisfaction and constructive-fixated retirement dissatisfaction forms. Some of these tendencies were confirmed in logistic regression analysis.

Regarding the role of gender in retirement satisfaction forms, our findings suggest that male and female retirees are equally distributed in stabilized-progressive and resigned-stabilized retirement satisfaction forms, considering the gender distribution of the whole sample. Nevertheless, our findings also show that male retirees are more likely to experience resigned retirement satisfaction, whereas women are more likely to be in the constructive-fixated retirement dissatisfaction form. As in past research that has found inconsistent and sometimes limited results regarding the role of gender in retirement adjustment, our results

may agree somewhat with studies that found lower retirement satisfaction and more retirement adjustment problems in women than in men (Secombe & Lee, 1986; Richardson & Kilty, 1991). However, by examining the quality of retirement satisfaction, our study allows us to better understand the previous inconsistent results on the role of gender in adjustment to retirement. While men seem to be more satisfied with their retirement than women, they were only shown to be resigned to their new situation. In contrast, women might be less satisfied with their retirement than men, but they express the intention to do something in the future to change their negative perception of retirement. In this sense, our results also provide support for previous research that found more positive attitudes towards retirement in women than men (Atchley, 1982; Isaksson & Johnsson, 2000; Jewson, 1982). Thus, taking into consideration this qualitative perspective, our results can, to some extent, explain previous inconsistent findings regarding the relationship between gender and adjustment to retirement. While some studies could be capturing higher levels of satisfaction in men with their current retirement situation, others could be capturing the more positive behavioral willingness of women to increase their satisfaction with retirement.

Regarding the predictors related to retirement transition, we found that both aspects of the individual's perception of his/her capacity to control the exit from the workforce predict retirement satisfaction forms. While retirees who retired voluntarily are more likely to experience a constructive form of retirement satisfaction (such as stabilized-progressive retirement satisfaction), retirees whose transition to retirement was obligatory are more likely to report constructive-fixated retirement dissatisfaction. This finding is congruent with past research that found higher levels of satisfaction and more positive retirement attitudes among retirees who perceived that they had retired voluntarily (e.g. Kloep & Hendry, 2006; Reitzes & Mutran, 2004; Shultz et al., 1998). A somewhat unexpected finding refers to the association between voluntary retirement transition and resigned retirement satisfaction. This result could

highlight that some retirees who voluntarily decided to retire are resigned to their new situation and, thus, only experience resigned satisfaction. Future research should analyze possible reasons for this association more in depth.

Furthermore, our findings also suggest that retirees with stabilized-progressive and resigned retirement satisfaction are more likely to experience higher retirement intentions than retirees from a constructive-fixated retirement dissatisfaction pattern. In the case of stabilized-progressive retirement satisfaction quality, these results could indicate that intentions towards retirement reflect one's willingness to retire in order to undertake other non-work related activities and achieve personal goals that are not related to one's professional career. In contrast, the reason for high retirement intentions in retirees from the resigned retirement satisfaction pattern could be the desire to escape from the workplace or the organizations for which they worked. As argued by Quick and Moen (1998), those who view retirement as an escape from an unpleasant environment are more likely to perceive the period of retirement as satisfying. However, according to our results, we could suggest that these individuals feel satisfied with their retirement only because they think they could be worse-off (for instance, if they continued working). Therefore, our results highlight the need to examine the quality of retirement satisfaction in order to better understand how retirees experience their retirement.

Finally, our findings also show that the examined retirement satisfaction forms impact retirees' psychological well-being. We found that retirees who experience stabilized-progressive and resigned-stabilized retirement satisfaction qualities exhibit better psychological well-being than retirees who take part in the constructive-fixated retirement dissatisfaction pattern. These results coincide with our assumptions, showing that more constructive aspects of retirement satisfaction lead to greater well-being. Moreover, resigned retirement satisfaction quality was not related to well-being, implying that its impact on well-being is the same as that of constructive-fixated retirement dissatisfaction. In this vein, our

results indicate that special attention should be paid to retirees who are not satisfied with their retirement and report getting stuck in their problems, in order to help them improve their well-being in retirement. Since we found that they are also willing to alter their situation, we could encourage them to mobilize their attempts at problem-solving in order to change their retirement experiences and, consequently, perceive greater psychological well-being.

Apart from the selectivity of the sample, it is also important to note that the sample was limited in size, which prevents us from drawing any general conclusions about forms of retirement satisfaction. Nevertheless, we used a heterogeneous sample in terms of occupation, age, and level of education. Moreover, retirement transition variables (retirement intentions and voluntariness of retirement transition) were measured retrospectively. Such retrospective responses are susceptible to cognitive consistency bias, such as recall bias, and, thus, have to be interpreted with caution. Nevertheless, Beehr and Nielson (1995), in their longitudinal study, report high correlations between retirees' retrospective reports and their prior reports, which provides some support for the validity of these responses. Future research should employ longitudinal designs to examine the propositions of this study, following older workers from employment to retirement.

Future studies should also be carried out to further address the validity of the dynamic model of retirement satisfaction. For instance, in the present study we did not find five retirement satisfaction forms as it is suggested by the dynamic model. Our results also showed less retirement satisfaction forms compared to previous research on dynamic model of job satisfaction that mostly identified five or six forms. Although we carefully adapted the job satisfaction items to measure retirement satisfaction, future research could assess the validity of the retirement satisfaction scale on larger and more representative samples. In this way, future studies might examine if the measurement issues are the cause for differential results in terms of job satisfaction vs. retirement satisfaction. Moreover, some satisfaction forms could

not be as relevant for the retiree population as they are for the employees. For instance, progressive satisfaction form implies career development in the case of employees, whereas in retirees it could refer to personal development. Undoubtedly, these issues call for additional evidence to conclude about the utility of the dynamic model of retirement satisfaction in the study of adjustment to retirement.

Despite its limitations, the present findings have several implications for policy and practice, suggesting different actions that might be considered to improve retirement adjustment. The results have shown that the quality of satisfaction (satisfaction forms) is an important predictor of psychological well-being. In this sense, we have identified people showing constructive-fixated retirement satisfaction as a potential risk group. On the contrary, people in stabilized-progressive and resigned-stabilized satisfaction showed higher levels of well-being. Besides, we have identified potential antecedents of the different forms of satisfaction. Based on that, we consider that the present research can be informative at least for two types of prevention strategies: primary and secondary interventions.

Secondary interventions, on one hand, might be directed to avoid negative effects of some forms of satisfaction on well-being. People working with older people's well-being should take into account, not only that retirement satisfaction has an impact on retirees' well-being, but that different satisfaction qualities could influence those levels as well. Secondary interventions could be drawn by paying attention to the contents of those satisfaction forms related to higher levels of psychological well-being. In this sense actions could be addressed to maintain or increase retirees' levels of aspiration, for instance maintaining patterns of activities and relationships established prior to retirement.

Primary interventions, on the other hand, could be recommended during the retirement processes to increase retirement satisfaction forms highly related to well-being. At least three factors could be considered by the organizations and governments. First, retirement intentions

of older employees approaching the retirement age could be assessed to better prepare individuals who exhibit lower intentions given that lower intentions were found to increase the likelihood of exhibiting the least adaptive satisfaction form: constructive-fixed retirement dissatisfaction². Second, organizations should support voluntary exit from the workforce in order to facilitate better adjustment to retirement. Further research should also examine which factors determine the process of retirement to be perceived as voluntary, and how to adjust the intentions to retire to the moment of actual retirement. In this sense, the implementation of more flexible types of retirement such as phased and part-time retirement has been suggested to increase older workers' control in the retirement process (Hedge, 2008). Third, since gender differences have been identified with regard to satisfaction forms, a gender perspective should be included in retirement planning programs. Interventions for prevention of less adaptive forms of retirement satisfaction seem to be a priority for females. Moreover, further research should inquire deeply into which factors are related to gender differences in satisfaction forms. Since previous research has shown gender differences in work related factors such as career patterns, and expectations about work and retirement, the incidence of those factors on retirement satisfaction should be explored (Onyx & Baker, 2006).

To conclude, the present study contributes significant findings to this area of research, showing that different forms of retirement satisfaction can be identified among retirees. These different forms were determined by gender as well as by factors related to the retirement transition process, and they were found to be related to retirees' psychological well-being. Although more research is needed to validate these findings with larger, more representative samples of retirees, this study highlights the need to focus on the quality of retirement satisfaction, exploring its antecedents and consequences to help retirees adjust more

² We are thankful to the anonymous reviewer for this suggestion.

effectively to their transition from employment to retirement and, consequently, improve their quality of life after retirement.

References

- Ajzen, I., & Madden, T. J. (1986). Prediction of goal-directed behavior; Attitudes, intentions, and perceived behavioral control. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 22*, 453-474.
- Arber, S., & Ginn, J. (1991). *Gender and later life: A sociological analysis of resources and constraints*. London: Sage.
- Ashforth, B. (2001). *Role transitions in organizational life: An identity based perspective*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Atchley, R. C. (1982). The process of retirement: Comparing women and men. In M. Szinovacz (Ed.), *Women's retirement: Policy implications of current research* (pp. 153-168). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Atchley, R. C. (1999). Continuity theory, self, and social structure. In C. D. Ryff & V. W. Marshall (Eds.), *Families and retirement* (pp. 145–158). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Beehr, T. A., & Nielson, N. L. (1995). Descriptions of job characteristics and retirement activities during the transition to retirement. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 16*, 681–690.
- Bruggemann, A. (1974). Zur unterscheidung verschiedener formen von ‘Arbeitszufriedenheit’ [The differetniation of different forms of ‘work satisfaction’]. *Arbeit und Leistung, 28*, 281-284.
- Bruggemann, A. (1976). Zur empirischen untersuchung verschiedener formen der Arbeitszufriedenheit [An empirical investigation of different forms of work satisfaction]. *Zeitschrift für Arbeitswissenschaft, 30*, 71-74.

- Büssing, A. (1992). A dynamic view of job satisfaction in psychiatric nurses in Germany. *Work & Stress, 6*, 239-259.
- Büssing, A., & Bissels, T. (1998). Different forms of work satisfaction: Concept and qualitative research. *European Psychologist, 3*, 209-218.
- Büssing, A., Bissels, T., Fuchs, V., & Perrar, K. M. (1999). A dynamic model of work satisfaction: Qualitative approaches. *Human Relations, 52*, 999-1028.
- Cohen, J., & Cohen, P. (2003). *Applied multiple regression/correlation analysis for the behavioral sciences*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Elder, G. H., & Johnson, M. K. (2003). The life course and aging: Challenges, lessons, and new directions. In R. A. Settersten Jr. (Ed.), *Invitation to the life course: Toward new understandings of later life* (pp. 49–81). Amityville, NY: Baywood.
- Fouquereau, E., Fernandez, A., Fonseca, A. M., Paul, M. C., & Uotinen, V. (2005). Perceptions of and satisfaction with retirement: A comparison of six European Union countries. *Psychology and Aging, 20*, 524-528.
- Gall, T. L., Evans, D. R., & Howard, J. (1997). The retirement adjustment process: Changes in the well-being of male retirees across time. *Journal of Gerontology, 52B*, 110-117.
- Gee, S., & Baillie, J. (1999). Happily ever after? An exploration of retirement expectations. *Educational Gerontology, 25*, 109-128.
- Gee, G. C., Liang, J., Bennett, J., Krause, N., Kobayashi, E., Fukaya, T., & Sugihara, Y. (2007). Trajectories of Alcohol Consumption among Older Japanese Followed from 1987-1999. *Research on Aging, 29*, 323-347.
- Goldberg, D. (1979). *Manual of the General Health Questionnaire*. London: NFER- Nelson.
- Haynes, T. L., Heckhausen, J., Chipperfield, J. G., Perry, R. P., & Newell, N. E. (2009). Primary and secondary control strategies: Implications for health and well-being among older adults. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology, 28*, 165-197.

- Hedge, J. W. (2008). Strategic human resource management and the older worker. *Journal of Workplace Behavioral Health, 23*, 109-123.
- Hornstein, G. A., & Wapner, S. (1985). Modes of experiencing and adapting to retirement. *International Journal of Aging and Human Development, 21*, 281-315.
- Isaksson, K. (1997). Patterns of adjustment to early retirement. Reports from the Department of Psychology (No. 828). Stockholm: Stockholm University.
- Isaksson, K., & Johansson, G. (2000). Adaptation to continued work and early retirement following downsizing: Long-term effects and gender differences. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 73*, 241-256.
- Jewson, R. H. (1982). After retirement: An exploratory study of the professional women. In M. Szinovacz (Ed.), *Women's retirement: Policy implications of current research* (pp. 169-181). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Kim, S., & Feldman, D. C. (2000). Working in retirement: The antecedents of bridge employment and its consequences for quality of life in retirement. *Academy of Management Journal, 43*, 1195-1210.
- Kim, J. E., & Moen, P. (2001). Moving into retirement: Preparations and transitions in late midlife. In M. E. Lachman (Ed.), *Handbook of midlife development* (pp. 487-527). New York: John Wiley and Sons.
- Kloep, M., & Hendry, L. B. (2006). Pathways into retirement: Entry or exit? *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 79*, 569-593.
- Onyx, J., & Baker, E. (2006). Retirement expectations: Gender differences and partner effects in an Australian employer-funded sample. *Australasian Journal on Ageing, 25*, 80-83.
- Quick, H. E., & Moen, P. (1998). Gender, Employment, and Retirement Quality: A Life Course Approach to the Differential Experiences of Men and Women. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 3*, 44-64.

- Reitzes, D. C., & Mutran, E. J. (2004). The transition to retirement: Stages and factors that influence retirement adjustment. *International Journal of Aging and Human Development*, 59, 63-84.
- Richardson, V., & Kilty, K. (1991). Adjustment to retirement: Continuity versus discontinuity. *International Journal of Aging and Human Development*, 32, 151-169.
- Seccombe, K., & Lee, G. R. (1986). Gender differences in retirement satisfaction and its antecedents. *Research on Aging*, 8, 426-440.
- Shultz, K., Morton, K. R., & Weckerle, J. R. (1998). The influence of push and pull factors on voluntary and involuntary early retirees' retirement decision and adjustment. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 53, 45-57.
- Taylor, M. A., Shultz, K. S., Spiegel, P. E., Morrison, R. F., & Green, J. (2007). Occupational attachment and met expectations as predictors of retirement adjustment of naval officers. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 37, 1697-1725.
- Terry, D. J., Hogg, M. A., & White, K. M. (1999). The theory of planned behaviour: Self-identity, social identity and group norms. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 38, 225-244.
- Van Solinge, H., & Henkens, K. (2007). Involuntary retirement: The role of restrictive circumstances, timing, and social embeddedness. *Journal of Gerontology: Social Sciences*, 62B, S295-S303.
- Wang, M. (2007). Profiling Retirees in the Retirement Transition and Adjustment Process: Examining the Longitudinal Change Patterns of Retirees' Psychological Well-Being. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92, 455-474.

Table 1. Means for the four cluster solution of the Retirement Satisfaction items

<i>Retirement satisfaction items</i>		Stabilized- progressive satisfaction	Resigned- stabilized satisfaction	Resigned satisfaction	Constructive- fixated dissatisfaction
1.	I like being retired (degree of satisfaction).	4.84	3.55	4.55	1.97
2.	I'm satisfied with being retired (intensity of satisfaction).	4.91	3.70	4.55	2.08
3.	Being retired is exactly right for me because I really feel fine with it (intensity of satisfaction).	4.82	3.30	4.48	2.32
4.	One cannot expect one's needs and wishes to be satisfied in retirement (level of aspiration).	3.48	3.41	3.55	3.14
5.	Regarding my retirement, I have become more demanding over the course of time (level of aspiration).	2.45	2.48	3.17	3.08
6.	Somehow I am dissatisfied with being retired, but I don't know what to do (fixated dissatisfaction aspect).	1.02	1.73	2.86	3.16
7.	I'm satisfied with being retired – I always say it could be worse (resigned satisfaction aspect).	3.67	3.21	4.00	2.49

Table 1 (cont.)

		Stabilized- progressive satisfaction	Resigned- stabilized satisfaction	Resigned satisfaction	Constructive- fixated dissatisfaction
8.	I'm dissatisfied with being retired, I often feel angry; if nothing can be done about it, I will start looking for another alternative (constructive dissatisfaction aspect).	1.04	1.14	2.31	3.03
9.	I'm dissatisfied with being retired, I often feel angry; however, I think I can change something in the future (constructive dissatisfaction aspect).	1.07	1.23	2.41	3.32
10.	Since I don't expect too much I may be pretty satisfied with being retired (resigned satisfaction aspect).	2.53	2.82	3.83	2.86
11.	I'm truly satisfied with being retired and in the near future I would like everything to remain as good as it is now (stabilized satisfaction aspect).	4.87	3.93	4.24	2.70
12.	I'm truly satisfied with being retired, especially since I can really achieve personal development (progressive satisfaction aspect).	4.89	3.95	4.28	2.81

Note. Means relevant for the interpretation of the retirement (dis)satisfaction forms are marked in bold. The aspect each item measures is presented in the parentheses after each item

Table 2 *Descriptive statistics of the obtained clusters*

		% of Total	SPS	RSS	RS	CFD	χ^2/F	<i>df</i>
gender	female	27.0	31.0	22.2	10.3	37.98	7.58*	3
	male	73.0	69.0	77.8	89.7	62.2		
marital status	married	71.5	70.3	71.4	80.0	67.7	1.16	3
	single	28.5	29.7	28.6	20.0	32.3		
level of education	university degree	38.4	35.7	46.2	42.9	29.4	14.17	9
	secondary education	51.5	53.6	38.5	53.6	64.7		
	basic education	9.6	10.7	15.4	3.6	2.9		
occupational status	no studies	.5	/	/	/	2.9	19.16	15
	management	27.2	31.3	21.3	22.2	29.4		
	middle-level	30.9	33.7	25.5	44.4	20.6		
	supervisors	6.3	4.8	12.8	3.7	2.9		
	technical staff	18.8	16.9	19.1	18.5	23.5		
voluntariness of retirement	qualified workers	15.2	13.3	21.3	7.4	17.6	26.90**	3
	non-qualified workers	1.6	/	/	3.7	5.9		
	voluntary	63.9	78.8	56.4	75.0	32.4		
	obligatory	36.1	21.2	43.6	25.0	67.6		
income	less than 1200	14.9	7.1	15.4	11.5	36.4	18.58*	9
	1200-2000	48.2	51.2	46.2	61.5	33.3		
	2000-3000	25.6	29.8	26.9	15.4	21.2		
	more than 3000	11.3	11.9	11.5	11.5	9.1		
Retirement intentions	<i>M</i>	2.64	3.36	2.20	2.92	1.72	13.59**	3,
	<i>SD</i>	1.56	1.63	1.28	1.55	.81		
health	<i>M</i>	3.21	1.92	1.77	2.04	2.00	.27	3,
	<i>SD</i>	1.41	1.45	1.39	1.46	1.63		

Notes. SPS – stabilized-progressive satisfaction; RSS – resigned-stabilized satisfaction; RS – resigned satisfaction; CFD – constructive-fixated dissatisfaction. Cells represent proportions of participants within each category. Post-hoc analyses in case of retirement intentions were performed using Bonferroni (SPS>RSS, SPS>CFD, RS>CFD). * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$.

Table 3. *Logistic regression results about antecedents of retirement satisfaction forms*

Predictor	Stabilized-progressive			Resigned- stabilized			Resigned		
	retierment satisfaction			retierment satisfaction			retierment satisfaction		
	OR	SE	95% CI	OR	SE	95% CI	OR	SE	95% CI
sex (1-female)	.96	.57	.31-2.96	.43	.60	.13-1.39	.15	.89**	.02-.85
retirement transition (1-obligatory)	.26	.53*	.09-.74	.38	.53	.13-1.07	.18	.67**	.05-.67
income	1.52	.29	.85-2.70	1.15	.30	.64-2.05	1.00	.36	.49-2.05
intentions	1.92	.20**	1.31-2.82	1.22	.20	.82-1.82	1.56	.23*	1.00-2.43

Note. OR-odd ratio; SE – standard error; CI-confidence interval; Reference category: constructive-fixated retirement dissatisfaction. * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$.

Table 4 *Hierarchical linear regression results of psychological well-being on retirement satisfaction forms*

	psychological well-being		
	β	R^2	ΔR^2
Step 1		.03	
Age	-.03		
Gender	-.04		
Level of education	.17*		
Step 2		.11	.08**
Age	-.01		
Gender	-.05		
Level of education	.17*		
Retirement satisfaction form			
stabilized-progressive	.38**		
resigned-stabilized	.20*		
resigned	.15		

Notes: * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; ^a Reference category: constructive-fixated retirement satisfaction form.